



experience was not accepted. He was not credited for experience as a Department Manager or Satellite Technician. Thus, Bautista was found to be lacking one year of applicable experience. On appeal, Bautista states that he has been a Keyboarding Clerk 1 for over four years. Thus, he believes he meets the requirements for the examination.

Matthew Espino indicated one position on his application, Receptionist with New York Sports Club. Official records indicate that he also was regularly appointed to Keyboarding Clerk 1 on September 10, 2010. He was not credited for experience as a Receptionist and was found to be lacking one year of applicable experience. On appeal, Matthew Espino states that he has been a Keyboarding Clerk 1 for eight years. He indicates his duties include helping a customer service supervisor to do shut offs, closing work orders for the distribution supervisor, distributing daily jobs to technicians, and answering customer phone calls and helping them with problems and taking payments.

Otilia Espino listed one position on her application, Administrative Assistant for a Real Estate Agent. Official records indicate that she also was regularly appointed to Keyboarding Clerk 1 on September 12, 2013. She was not credited for experience as an Administrative Assistant and was found to be lacking one year of applicable experience. On appeal, Otilia Espino states that she has been a Keyboarding Clerk 1 for more than four years. Her duties include taking customer phone calls and helping them with problems, and posting credit card information and payments.

On her application, Rivera indicated experience as a Keyboarding Clerk 1. However, she copied duties from the job specification for the title under test. As this is not acceptable, she was contacted for clarification of her actual duties, and she did not reply. Therefore, her experience in this position was not credited and she was found to be lacking one year of applicable experience. On appeal, Rivera states that she has been a Keyboarding Clerk 1 for more than a year. Thus, she believes she meets the requirements for the examination.

In support of these appeals, the appointing authority provided the dates of service for each in their Keyboarding Clerk 1 positions. When asked for duties, the appointing authority indicated that each appellant performed the following:

- Answers phone calls and customer inquiries;
- Provides customer service regarding payment, shut-offs, meter servicing, etc.;
- Operate various office equipment including, but not limited to, keyboard equipment, calculators, printers, photocopier, and fax machines;

Receives records from Finance Department regarding bounced checks and charges on credit cards. Reverses payment, applying necessary fees, and mails out correspondence to notify the customers;  
Works with the Distribution Department in electronically filling out daily service orders for curb box; and  
Enters payments, runs journals, and balances out registers.

### CONCLUSION

*N.J.A.C.* 4A:4-2.6(a) provides that applicants shall meet all requirements specified in the promotional examination announcement by the closing date.

In the instant matter, credit was given only for clerical experience operating an alphanumeric keyboard or typewriter to produce documents such as letters, memos, reports, charts, forms and other materials. The appellants did not provide a list of duties, either in their original applications or on appeal, that indicate that this was the primary focus of their Keyboarding Clerk 1 positions. The list of duties provided by the appointing authority also did not include this as the primary focus. Clearly, the appellants are not primarily performing work required of a Keyboarding Clerk. The primary duties of incumbents in the Keyboarding Clerk classification include processing documents and performing clerical work requiring the utilization of keyboard or typing skills, and typing documents on a computer console. The primary duties of the appellants' position are in customer service. The announced experience requirement was also not the primary focus of the positions outside of local government service. As such, the appellants do not meet the minimum experience qualifications for the subject title.

An independent review of all material presented indicates that the decisions of Agency Services that the appellants did not meet the announced requirements for eligibility by the closing date is amply supported by the record. The appellants provide no basis to disturb these decisions. Thus, the appellants have failed to support their burden of proof in these matters. Finally, since the appellants are not performing duties consistent with a Keyboarding Clerk classification, the matter of the proper classification of their positions is referred to Agency Services for classification audits.

### ORDER

Therefore, it is ordered that these appeals be denied. It is further ordered that the matter of the proper classification of the appellants' positions be referred to Agency Services for classification audits.

This is the final administrative determination in this matter. Any further review should be pursued in a judicial forum.

DECISION RENDERED BY THE  
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION ON  
THE 5<sup>th</sup> DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2018



Deirdré L. Webster Cobb  
Chairperson  
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries  
and  
Correspondence

Christopher S. Myers  
Director  
Division of Appeals and Regulatory Affairs  
Civil Service Commission  
Written Record Appeals Unit  
P. O. Box 312  
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0312

c: Franklin Bautista (CSC Docket No. 2018-3557)  
Matthew Espina (CSC Docket No. 2018-3534)  
Otilia Espina (CSC Docket No. 2018-3536)  
Nancy Rivera (CSC Docket No. 2018-3537)  
James Gallagher  
Kelly Glenn  
Records Center